

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06054 01 OF 03 302244Z

70 62  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-08 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-04

L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 /074 W  
----- 043422

R 301830Z OCT 74  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8511  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 6054

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: PARM, NATO  
SUBJECT: WG RESPONSES TO SPC QUESTIONS ON NON-INCREASE OF AIR MANPOWER

REF: STATE 235457

1. WE TRANSMIT BELOW DRAFT RESPONSES TO SPC QUESTIONS ON NON-INCREASE OF AIR MANPOWER WHICH WG STAFF PREPARED ON BASIS DISCUSSION AT OCTOBER 29 WG MEETING (REPORTED SEPTEL). MISSION BELIEVES THESE RESPONSES ARE GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH REFTEL AND THAT THEY CAN PROVIDE BASIS FOR SPC TO MOVE AHEAD WITH GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP ON NON-INCREASE PROPOSAL. ACCORDINGLY, UNLESS WASHINGTON INSTRUCTS US TO THE CONTRARY, WE WILL SUPPORT TRANSMITTAL OF THESE RESPONSES TO THE SPC AT NEXT WG MEETING, NOVEMBER 5.

2. COMMENTS ON DRAFT:

A. FIRST QUESTION, PARA ONE B: UK REP PROPOSED THIS PARA  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06054 01 OF 03 302244Z

AND NOTED THAT UK HAD LOWERED EARLIER ESTIMATE OF INCREASE OF NINE HUNDRED AF PERSONNEL TO SIX HUNDRED.

B. FIRST QUESTION, PARA ONE C: SHAPE REP, SUPPORTED BY CANADIAN, PRESSED FOR INCLUSION OF THIS PARA.

C. FIRST QUESTION, PARA TWO A: AWKWARD FORMULATION  
HERE REPRESENTS STAFF EFFORT TO SYNTHESIZE SUGGESTIONS OF  
SEVERAL REPS. U.S. REP DREW ON PARA 2 REFTEL AND PARA 7, STATE  
229321 IN DISCUSSION.

D. QUESTION 3, PARA THREE: SHAPE REP PRESSED FOR THIS  
PARA. WE WILL SUGGEST AT NEXT MEETING DELETION OR CHANGE IN  
SHAPE FOOTNOTE WHICH WE BELIEVE COULD BE MISLEADING IN ITS PRESENT  
FORM. FRG SAID THERE WAS NEED TO ACCOMMODATE POSSIBLE AIR MANPOWER  
INCREASES IN NATURAL DISASTERS, BUT WG DECIDED NOT TO ADDRESS  
THIS ISSUE IN DRAFT.

E. QUESTION 4, PARA FOUR: CANADIAN REP PROPOSED THIS PARA,  
AND SAID HIS AUTHORITIES SUPPORT U.S. NON-INCREASE PROPOSAL  
BECAUSE IT DOES NOT INCLUDE SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS. HE SAID OTTAWA  
WOULD HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH PROPOSAL FOR AIR MANPOWER SUB-CEILING.

F. QUESTION 5: TURKISH REP ARGUED AT GREAT LENGTH THAT  
A FREEZE ON AIR MANPOWER IN THE NGA WOULD HAVE ADVERSE  
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FLANKS. ALL OTHER REPS SUPPORTED U.S.  
APPROACH, PARA 6 REFTEL. TURKISH REP AGREED TO REPORT DRAFT  
SET FORTH BELOW BUT SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WERE LIKELY TO HAVE  
PROBLEMS WITH IT.

### 3. BEGIN TEXT

#### QUESTION 1

WOULD A NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT ON AIR MANPOWER MEAN  
THE ABANDONMENT OF ANY PLANNED INCREASES, IMPROVEMENTS  
OR RE-EQUIPMENT?

ONE. A. ALL NATIONS CONCERNED, EXCEPT THE UK, HAVE  
STATED THEY HAVE NO CURRENT PLANS WHICH WOULD IMPEDED  
BY A NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06054 01 OF 03 302244Z

B. THE UK STATED THAT THEIR AIR FORCE RE-EQUIPMENT  
PLANS FORESEE AN INCREASE OF ABOUT 600 AIR FORCE PERSONNEL IN  
THE NGA TO MAN ADDITIONAL AIRCRAFT AND AD SYSTEMS, WHICH ARE  
PROPOSED FOR INTRODUCTION INTO THE NGA WITHIN THE NEXT FEW  
YEARS (SUBJECT TO THE UK DEFENCE REVIEW). THE UK HOPES THAT  
AN INCREASE ON THIS SCALE, IN THE CONTEXT OF AN AGGREGATED  
CEILING FOR AIR MANPOWER, COULD BE ABSORBED WITHIN THE AGREED  
FIGURE FOR DAY TO DAY FLUCTUATIONS OF STRENGTH WHICH SHOULD  
BE ALLOWED FOR IN ANY NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT.

C. THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW AND SOPHISTICATED  
AIRCRAFT INTO EUROPE AS PART OF NATIONAL RE-EQUIPMENT PLANS  
COULD REQUIRE LARGER NUMBERS OF PERSONNEL TO SUPPORT EACH  
AIRCRAFT THAN IS THE CASE FOR PRESENT TYPES. ALTHOUGH

STUDIES ALREADY COMPLETED SUGGEST THAT THIS WILL NOT BE THE CASE FOR ALL PLANNED RE-EQUIPMENTS, IT IS A CONSIDERATION WHICH COULD AFFECT THOSE AIR FORCES WHOSE RE-EQUIPMENT PLANS ARE NOT YET FINALISED.

TWO. THE WORKING GROUP FIND THAT:

A. A NON-INCREASE PROVISION WILL NOT IMPEDE ANY CURRENTLY PLANNED INCREASE OR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NGA PROVIDED THAT (1) AN ALLOWANCE IS MADE FOR FLUCTUATIONS IN THE AGGREGATE TOTAL OF AIR MANPOWER ACCEPTED AT THE TIME OF THE AGREEMENT; AND (2) THE NON-INCREASE IS FORMULATED AND APPLIED TO AGGREGATE AIR MANPOWER OR TO AGGREGATE AIR/GROUND MANPOWER, AND NOT TO INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL AIR MANPOWER TOTALS.

B. THERE WILL ALSO BE A REQUIREMENT FOR CLOSE CO-OPERATION AND CO-ORDINATION BETWEEN THE NATO NATIONS CONCERNED IN DEVELOPING FUTURE PROPOSALS FOR AIRCRAFT IMPROVEMENTS AND RE-EQUIPMENT WITHIN THE NGA.

QUESTION 2.

WHAT EXCEPTIONS WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR TRAINING, EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS?

ONE. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS, FOLLOWING THE GUIDANCE IN  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06054 01 OF 03 302244Z

C-M(74)8(2ND REVISE) HAVE ALREADY MADE THE POINT, IN RESPECT OF GROUND FORCES, THAT EXCEPTIONS TO FORCE LEVELS WILL BE REQUIRED FOR SUCH PURPOSES AS EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS. IT IS NOTED THAT, FOLLOWING THE SAME PRINCIPLE THE US PAPER OF 18 OCTOBER STATES "ANY PROVISION THAT LIMITS AIR MANPOWER TO PRESENT LEVELS SHOULD PERMIT EXISTING PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO EXERCISES AND REPLACEMENTS FOR NATO".

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06054 02 OF 03 302335Z

70  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-08 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-04

L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 /074 W  
----- 044064

R 301830Z OCT 74  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8512

SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 6054

TWO. AS THE NON-INCREASE, TO WHICH THE QUESTION  
RELATES, WOULD NOT, PER SE, AFFECT THE LEVELS OF AIR  
MANPOWER OR OF AIR FORCES IN THE NAGA, AS CURRENTLY FORESEEN,  
THE WORKING GROUP TAKE THE VIEW THAT THE US POINT ABOVE IS  
VALID IN THAT EXISTING PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO TRAINING,  
EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS FOR AIR FORCES IN THE NGA SHOULD  
BE RESPECTED.

THREE. IT SHOULD BE PRACTICABLE TO OBTAIN FROM THE  
NATIONS CONCERNED (CA, UK, US) A STATEMENT OF THEIR CURRENT  
REQUIREMENTS TO INTRODUCE AIR FORCES INTO THE AREA FOR  
ROTATION AND EXERCISE PURPOSES, WITH AN ESTIMATE IN EACH  
CASE OF THE NUMBERS OF MEN SO INTRODUCED. IT SHOULD ALSO BE  
PRACTICABLE TO OBTAIN FROM THE INDIGENOUS NATIONS (BE, LUX,  
FRG, NL), STATEMENTS OF THE NUMBERS OF AIR FORCE PERSONNEL  
WHO ARE PERIODICALLY ADDED TO THE MEAN AVERAGE OF THE  
PEACETIME STANDING FORCE FOR EXERCISES AND FOR ROTATION,  
E.G. AT PEAK DRAFT PERIODS. HAVING OBTAINED THESE FIGURES IT  
WILL BE NECESSARY TO ADD A SMALL MARGIN TO ALLOW FOR INTER-  
REGIONAL NATO EXERCISES.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06054 02 OF 03 302335Z

FOUR. THE WORKING GROUP FIND THAT:

A. THE PRINCIPLE, OF ALLOWING FOR EXCEPTIONS TO  
FORCE LEVELS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED, AS IT WAS FOR GROUND FORCES.

B. THE DETAIL AND DEFINITION CAN BE LEFT TO A  
LATER STAGE.

FIVE. THE WORKING GROUP THEREFORE REQUESTS  
MEMBERS TO PROVIDE THE RELEVANT DETAILS (PARAGRAPH THREE)  
SO THAT THE WORKING GROUP CAN CONTINUE ITS STUDY OF THIS  
ISSUE IN MORE DETAIL.

QUESTION 3

ARE THERE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE  
ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO INCREASE THEIR AIR FORCES IN CENTRAL  
EUROPE WITHOUT JEOPARDISING AN MBFR AGREEMENT?

ONE. THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL HAS INCLUDED, IN  
ITS GUIDANCE ON THE ALLIANCE APPROACH TO NEGOTIATIONS ON MBFR,

THE FOLLOWING: "MBFR MEASURES SHOULD NOT BE OF SUCH SCOPE AND MAGNITUDE AS TO DIMINISH THE ABILITY OF THE ALLIES TO TAKE THE NECESSARY MILITARY STEPS TO FULFIL CURRENTLY AGREED NATO STRATEGY: FOWARD DEFENCE, FLEXIBLE RESPONSE AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE"(1).

FOOTNOTE:

(1) PARA 5, C-M(74(83(FINAL)

TWO. IN THAT CONTEXT, THE WORKING GROUP HAS VERIFIED THAT A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT NEED NOT IMPEDE ANY NATIONAL PLANS FOR AIR FORCE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NGA: AND THAT EXCEPTIONS TO AN AGREED CEILING FOR AIR MANPOWER WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ENABLE THE ALLIES TO AUGMENT TEMPORARILY TO COVER ROUTING EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS. THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, IN ITSELF, WOULD NOT DIMINISH THE FORCES (IN MANPOWER OR CAPABILITY) AS COMPARED WITH THE PRESENT AND PLANNED NATO FORCE LEVELS.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06054 02 OF 03 302335Z

THREE. IN A CRISIS OR EMERGENCY SITUATION THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO INCREASE THEIR AIR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. PRESENT PLANS PROVIDE FOR SACEUR, IN A PERIOD OF TENSION, TO CALL FOR AIR REINFORCEMENTS FROM NATIONS OUTSIDE THE NGA(2). IT APPEARS THAT SUCH REINFORCEMENTS COULD EXCEED THE NON-INCREASE PROVISIONS OF ANY MBFR AGREEMENT THEN IN FORCE.

FOOTNOTE:

(2) THE WORKING GROUP AGREE THAT THE PROVISIONS OF ANY NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER SHOULD BE FRAMED SO AS TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF SUCH PLANS AND NOT INHIBIT THEM IN ANY WAY.

FOUR. THUS, THE WORKING GROUP AGREE THAT FROM A MILITARY VIEWPOINT WHILE CONTINGENCIES MIGHT ARISE WHICH WOULD CALL FOR AN INCREASE OF AIR MANPOWER WITHIN THE NGA, THE WORKING GROUP DO NOT FORESEE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO MEET SUCH CONTINGENCIES EXCEPT IN THOSE WHICH, OF THEMSELVES, WOULD ALREADY HAVE JEOPARDISED AN MBFR AGREEMENT.

QUESTION 4

WOULD A CEILING ON AIR MANPOWER CONSTRAIN CERTAIN FORCE RESTRUCTURING POSSIBILITIES?

ONE. IF THE CEILING WERE APPLIED, NOT SPECIFICALLY TO AIR MANPOWER BUT RATHER TO AN AGGREGATE OF GROUND/AIR MANPOWER, THERE WOULD BE NO SUCH CONSTRAINT.

TWO. IF, HOWEVER, THE CEILING WERE FORMULATED

AND APPLIED SPECIFICALLY TO AIR MANPOWER, THERE  
COULD BE CONSTRAINT ON RESTRUCTURING POSSIBILITIES INVOLVING  
TRANSFER OF ARMY TASKS TO AIR FORCES. THE IMPLICATIONS WOULD  
DEPEND VERY LARGELY ON THE SCALE OF THE POSSIBLE RESTRUCTURING,  
RELATED TO THE AGGREGATE OF THE NATO AIR MANPOWER IN THE NGA.  
CLEARLY, A MAJOR RESTRUCTURING INVOLVING A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE  
IN AIR FORCE AGGREGATE MANPOWER COULD BE INTERPRETED AS A  
BREACH OF AN AGREEMENT. ON THE OTHER HAND, A RESTRUCTURING  
WHICH INVOLVED AN INCREASE IN AIR FORCE MANPOWER FALLING

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06054 02 OF 03 302335Z

WITHIN THE NORMAL DAY TO DAY FLUCTUATION OF STRENGTH FIGURES  
WOULD NOT BE SIGNIFICANT, AND NEED NOT BE CONSTRAINED.

THREE. OVERALL ALLIANCE AGGREGATE AIR MANNING LEVELS  
WOULD NOT HAVE TO BE INCREASED IN ORDER TO INSTITUTE  
RATIONALISATION/SPECIALISATION PLANS.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06054 03 OF 03 302316Z

70  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-08 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-04

L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 /074 W  
----- 043847

R 301830Z OCT 74  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8513  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 6054

FOUR. IN THE WIDER SENSE OF RESTRUCTURING WHICH  
COULD MEAN ALTERING THE BALANCE, STRUCTURE AND ROLES  
BETWEEN THE FORCES OF A NATION, A SPECIFIC CEILING ON  
AGGREGATE AIR MANPOWER COULD CONSTRAIN SUCH RESTRUCTURING  
IF CHANGES BY ONE ALLY COULD NOT BE ACCOMMODATED IN ALLIED  
AGGREGATES. THIS WOULD OF COURSE BE EQUALLY TRUE OF A  
CEILING ON GROUND FORCES ONLY.

QUESTION 5

WHAT, IF ANY, ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR  
THE FLANKS OF A FREEZE ON AIR MANPOWER IN THE NGA?

ONE. A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER  
NEED NOT, PER SE, AFFECT THE PLANNED FORCE LEVELS FOR AIR  
FORCES OF EITHER SIDE IN THE NGA.

TWO. FOR NATO IT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED THAT  
A NON-INCREASE NEED NOT IMPEDE ANY PLANS FOR FORCE  
IMPROVEMENTS OR INCREASES. IT NEED NOT AFFECT CURRENT OR  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06054 03 OF 03 302316Z

PLANNED LEVELS OF AIRCRAFT AND WOULD NOT THEREFORE INHIBIT  
OR IMPEDE ANY PLANS INVOLVING THE USE OF THOSE AIRCRAFT IN  
SUPPORT OF NATIONS IN THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN REGIONS.

THREEE. IT COULD BE ENVISAGED THAT, IF AN AIR  
MANPOWER NON-INCREASE IS SUGGESTED IN NEGOTIATIONS, THIS COULD  
PROVIDE THE EAST WITH AN OPENING TO SEEK TO BROADEN THE  
DISCUSSION OF THE FORCES WHICH SHOULD BE ADDRESSED FOR  
REDUCTIONS. THE WP IS, IN ANY CASE, PRESSING FOR THE  
INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER.

FOUR. THE WORKING GROUP DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE  
EXTENSION OF THE NON-INCREASE ON GROUND MANPOWER TO AIR  
MANPOWER WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT THE SECURITY OF THE FLANK STATES.  
ONLY FORCES WITHIN THE NGA WOULD BE COVERED. IT WOULD NOT  
AFFECT AIR MANPOWER IN FLANK STATES. IT WOULD NOT INHIBIT  
NATO'S ABILITY TO REINFORCE THE FLANKS IN EMERGENCIES.

END TEXT  
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 30 OCT 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO06054  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryeq.tel  
**Line Count:** 360  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 235457  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 27 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <23 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** WG RESPONSES TO SPC QUESTIONS ON NON-INCREASE OF AIR MANPOWER  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005